

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 stand rejected. Claims 1, 35, and 41 have been amended. Moreover, claims 27-34, 36, 44-48, 50 and 52 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-34, 36-38, 41-43, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner contended that the claims fail to set forth sufficient structural limitations to the claimed flocked article, relying upon ex parte Slob (PO BdApp) 157 USPQ 172. The Examiner inquired as to what structural limitations produce the claimed leakage property. Applicants believe that the facts set forth in ex parte Slob are clearly distinguishable from the facts of the present application. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have amended the claims to include the step that the layer of flock particulate is attached to the expanded PTFE by an electrostatic process. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, page 11, lines 3-15, and in the working examples. Applicants submit that the above amendment is sufficient to overcome the §112 rejection. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 35, 39, 40, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henn, for reasons of record. Claim 35 has been amended to include the limitation that the flock particulate is attached by an electrostatic process. Moreover, claims 39, 40 and 51 depend from claim 35. Since Henn neither discloses nor suggests the claimed electrostatic process of attaching the flock particulate nor the claimed wear test cycles to leakage of at least 50 cycles, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 44-48, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henn in view of Minor, for reasons of record. Claims 44-48 and 52 have been cancelled. Thus, this rejection has been rendered moot.

Finally, claims 27-28, 31-34, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumb et al. Claims 27, 28, 31-34, and 50 have been cancelled. Thus, this rejection has been rendered moot.

As all of the outstanding rejections have been addressed and overcome, applicants respectfully request issuance of a notice of allowance directed to claims 1-26, 35, 37-43, 49, and 51. Should the Office have any questions, the Office is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin J. Boland, 36,090
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: April 16, 2003